

# THE KINGDOM OF LABOR IS COMING

Edison Makes Predictions  
About Workers of Future

## WHAT IS IN EDISON'S MIND

Daily Stint of Eight Hours of Brain  
Labor—This He Thinks Will Be  
Brought About by Cheapening of  
Commodities—Predicts That the  
Workers of Future Will Live As  
Well As Capitalists of Today.

- WHAT IS IN THE MIND  
OF EDISON, INVENTOR.
- What Thos. A. Edison Predicts.
- Cheapening of commodities.
- Laborers living as well as men  
who now have \$200,000 in-  
come.
- Things He Deprecates.
- The monorail.
- Narrowness of railroad tracks.
- Chemical food.
- Make-up of society.
- Whiskey.
- Problems to be Overcome.
- Waste of fuel.
- Friction.

(New York World.)

Thomas A. Edison, looking into the future, thinks the prospect of the laboring man is a particularly bright one.

"In 200 years, by the cheapening of commodities, the ordinary laborer will live as well as a man does now with \$200,000 annual income. Automatic machinery and scientific agriculture will bring about this result," Mr. Edison says, in the current issue of the Independent. "Not individualism, but social labor will dominate the future; you can't have individual machines and every man working by himself. Industry will constantly become more social and interdependent. There will be no manual labor in the factories of the future. The men in them will be merely superintendents, watching the machinery to see that it works right.

### Eight Hours of Brain Work.

"The work day, I believe will be eight hours. Every man needs that much work to keep him out of mischief and to keep him happy. But it will be work with the brain, something that men will be interested in, and done in wholesome, pleasant surroundings. Less and less man will be used as an engine, or as a horse, and his brain will be employed to benefit himself and his fellows.

"The clothes of the future will be so cheap that every young woman will be able to follow the fashions promptly, and there will be plenty of fashions.

"Communication with other worlds has been suggested. I think we had better stick to this world and find out something about it before we call up our neighbors. They might make us ashamed of ourselves.

"The monorail does not appeal to me. It was a fundamental mistake that our railroads were built on a 4 foot 9 inch gauge instead of a 6 foot gauge, which we will probably have to come to yet.

### Aeroplane of the Future.

"The aeroplane of the future will, I think, have to be on the helicopter principle. A successful air machine must be able to defy the winds. If Wright's aeroplane had one-twentieth of its surface, the wind would not affect it. The helicopter principle is the only way to rise above atmospheric conditions. By increasing the velocity of propeller revolutions the size of the machine can be diminished and thereby we vanquish the hostility of the wind. A helicopter could have foot-size planes distributed on a 100 to 150 foot circle and controlled from the centre by wires.

"Chemical food has been worked out pretty well by Emil Fischer and his students, but it won't be a commercial proposition. You can't beat the farm as a laboratory, commercially speaking. If we should dry up like Mars and couldn't raise vegetables on the earth, we might turn to a chemical diet.

"Society will have to stop this whiskey business which is like throwing sand in the bearings of a steam engine.

"Among the many problems which await solution in the future one of the most important is to get the full

value out of fuel. The wastefulness of our present methods of combustion is tremendous.

"There is not as much power in a ton of 40 per cent dynamite as there is in a ton of coal.

"Everything in nature would burn up if it were not for the fact that nearly everything except coal is already burned up. Iron would burn and make a good fuel—if in a very fine powder—but it has already been consumed in Nature's furnace.

"We may discover the germ of getting all the power from fuel tomorrow, and then again it may take a long time to find out.

"To get rid of friction in our machines is one of the future problems. The only machine without friction that we know is the world, and it moves in the resistless ether."

### The New Anaesthetic.

Dr. Robert Morris, in the current issue of Harper's Weekly, reviews the progress made by Dr. Jonnesco, of Luca-Pest, in the development of a spinal anaesthesia, saying that while Dr. Jonnesco does not claim to have been the originator of the process, he regards himself as having perfected the details. It is not disputed that spinal anaesthesia was first brought to notice in 1855 by Dr. J. Leonard Corning, an American physician, who made the suggestion that this method could be utilized in place of general anaesthesia. But Dr. Morris says this suggestion attracted little attention till fourteen years later, when Dr. Corning published his book on Pain. Dr. Corning, as a student and neurologist was not interested greatly in the application of the method, and this probably is the reason why his discovery lay dormant so long.

Some ten years ago Dr. Dudley Tait, of San Francisco, experimented with "high" injection of cocaine in the spinal canal, and, for a time, the attention of the medical world was enlisted, but, as if by tacit consent, the idea was thereafter given up by surgeons. There were two reasons contributory to this abandonment: Surgeons knew that occasionally patients were found remarkably susceptible to the influence of cocaine or allied drugs, in which the toxic effect was likely to be disastrous. No one could tell in advance what the developments were likely to be, and inasmuch as cocaine was known to furnish surprises, there was fear that some of the other allied substances might show a like quality. Still again, there was fear that the remote results from spinal anaesthesia might cause unnecessary trouble for patients, and as a surgeon will not stand surprises much better than an Indian, it was vitally necessary to make sure that these contingencies would not arise. So the surgeons preferred the old methods of procedure.

Meanwhile, methods of inducing general anaesthesia by means of nitrous oxide, ether and chloroform have reached a high stage of perfection, and surgeons are slow to subject patients to any method not equally efficacious, and it therefore remains for some responsible man or group of men, in whom the surgeons have confidence, to prove beyond all controversy that the new method of producing anaesthesia is equal to the perfected old methods. Now, Dr. Jonnesco, a man of unquestioned standing, appearing as an exponent of the idea of spinal anaesthesia, and backed as he is by experiences extending over seven hundred cases, finds no difficulty in obtaining an audience, and one in a receptive mood, Dr. Morris thus illustrates the situation:

Our position is simply this: Dr. Jonnesco chooses stavaine instead of but he is facing a critical jury of several thousand men who know the responsibilities of their calling. Dr. Jonnesco chooses stavaine instead of cocaine for his anaesthetic, because it is much less toxic than cocaine, while he further intensifies its action, and guards at the same time against untoward results by the addition of minute quantities of strychnine.

Dr. Jonnesco appears to have very good data bearing out his idea in a practical way. It is, perhaps, the feeling of many surgeons, that we shall make use of spinal anaesthesia in certain selected groups of cases, and other forms of anaesthesia in other groups. Certain classes of patients take the common anaesthetics rather badly—alcoholics, for instance, and drug habits, as well as those with diseases of the heart and lungs. It is probable that spinal anaesthesia will be more frequently used by American surgeons in this group of cases, and that we will gradually extend its range as fast as we feel that we can do it safely.

Dr. Morris refers to four cases operated on at his clinic at the post-graduate hospital, New York, in one of which he felt considerable concern because of heart disease and nervous derangement, but all of these patients were as comfortable on the following day as could possibly be expected. The audience at this clinic was composed largely of surgeons, and the consensus of opinion was that Dr. Jonnesco had given a satisfactory demonstration so far as actual occurrences went. There were no evidences that these patients had been more subject to shock than those rendered unconscious by the use of ether or chloroform.

# THE PROBLEM OF LIFE

Tolstoi's Farewell Message to the  
World—Believes It to Be Each Man's  
Business to Make the World Happy

The great Russian reformer, Count Lyoff N. Tolstoi, the idol of the Russian peasant and a thorn in the side of Russian despotism, gives the following as his farewell message to the world:

My farewell message to the world—at my age every greeting is also a farewell—is my view as to how life should be framed in order that it may be henceforth, not as to heretofore bad and sad, but as God wishes and as we wish ourselves; that is, that it may be full of happiness and contentment.

The attainment of this aim depends upon the conception we have of our lives. If my conception of life is that my body (the body of John, Peter, or Mary) is given me in order that I may find in it as much pleasure, joy and fortune as possible, in that case my life must always, under all circumstances, be miserable or bad. The reason is that what I desire every one else desires. As every one wants the greatest amount of pleasure, and as the sum total of pleasure remains the same, there is not enough to go round. Therefore, every man who lives for himself must take something from others, hate others and make others unhappy. Even those who attain their purposes are never happy; they are tortured lest others should deprive them of their wealth, and envy others who have accumulated more than they.

The life of all men who live in the body must be miserable. All such men are unhappy. Life is given to us for real happiness. But to attain such happiness a man must understand that the real life is not in the body; that happiness is not reached in obeying the body's dictates, but in obeying the dictates of the spirit which lives in all men. The spirit asks for spiritual happiness. And as the spirit is one in all men asks for the happiness of all. To wish all men happiness forever, means to love all men. And the more a man loves, the freer and more joyful is his life.

The world is constituted that despite the best efforts no man can live as his body demands, because what his body demands is sometimes unattainable; and even if it is attained, that is only at the cost of fighting with others. But the spirit, the soul, can always live happily, because all that it demands is love, and to attain love no man has to fight with another. The more a man loves the nearer is he drawn to others. Why then do we not love? Each will be happier and more contented at the same time, and he will make others happier and more contented at the same time.

All holy and wise men of the world, and Christ himself, taught that our life is miserable through ourselves; that Power that sent us into life, which Power we call God, did not send us in order that we might torture ourselves, but rather that we might attain the happiness which we all desire. They taught also that we fail to attain the desired happiness only when we misunderstand life, and do as we ought not to do.

We complain of life, we complain that it is ill ordered. We fail to understand that it is not our life which is ill ordered, but that the mistakes are ours in doing what we ought not to do. We act as acts a drunkard who complains that there are too many drink shops, forgetting that the drink shops could not exist if there were not so many drunkards.

Life is given to us that it should be happy. It is our own business to make it happy. The way to make it a certain chain of unbroken happiness is to live in love and not in hatred.

We hear on all sides that life is bad and miserable because of its bad institutions; we need only, we are told, to change the bad institutions into good ones and life will change for the better. Do not believe that any particular institution can make life better or worse. Those people who most thirstily seek for the best institutions are themselves living in discord and quarreling. The institutions which some propose as the best others declare to be the worst; they desire to substitute their own ideals, which opponents agree to be very bad. And even if all institutions were the best conceivable, men could not live with them owing to their being used to a bad life, and we are content with it. We pretend that we would live better among better institutions. But how could institutions be better while men remain bad?

Must men be made better? At present all they do is promise you a good life if you, leading a bad life, fight with other men, overthrow them by force, and kill them in order to attain better conditions of life. That is, you are promised a better life if you become worse than you are. That is a delusion. There is only one way to attain a better life, and that is to become a better man.

Happiness, the happiness of yourself and others, can never be based upon the fallible institution sustained by force, but only upon the health of the soul. Only through the soul can the individual or the community attain the greatest happiness. The true happiness which every human heart pants for lies not in institutions upheld by force. It can be attained at any moment of life, by the path of love.

Such happiness was granted to us hundreds of years ago. Men, however, failed to understand it and did not grasp it. Now the time has come when we must accept it; firstly, because the folly and suffering of our lives have gone so far that our state is unbearable; secondly, the teaching of Christ has now become so plain that no man can fail to see it.

We reach salvation only by realizing that our life does not rest in the body but in the spirit of God which lives with us; that therefore all the efforts hitherto directed to the improvement of our bodily life must be directed to one single and essential work; that each must extend his love not only to those that love him, but as Christ says, to all men, especially to those who are alienated from us, or hate us. Today our life is so far removed from the ideal that it seems impossible to transfer our interest from worldly things to the one essential and unaccustomed work of love.

That, however, is a delusion. To love all, even those who hate us, is really so remote from our souls as to hate all and fight with all. A change in our conception of life is not impossible; the real impossibility is to continue the fight of all against all in which we are now engaged. Only such a change can deliver men from the suffering they now endure, and the change must therefore come sooner or later.

Why should we torture ourselves instead of remembering that the greatest happiness is destined for us? All depends upon ourselves. The path is easy and direct and brings nothing but happiness.

An objection is raised by those who suffer, by the poor and oppressed. "That is all right," they say, "for the rich and the rulers of men. They have the enemies in their power and can afford to love them. For us who suffer and are oppressed, that is another matter." That is not true. It is still easier for the poor than for the rich. The poor need do nothing that is against the command of love; they need take no part in deeds of violence. For the rich the gospel of love is harder.

### THE HERO LOCATED.

Swam the Creek and Got the Boat Before the Battle of Plymouth.

(Smithfield Herald.)

Not long since I wrote an article which was published in the Smithfield Herald, headed: "A deed of heroism performed by a private in the ranks at Plymouth, N. C., in 1864."

In answer to my letter last week's mail brought me the following:

"In answer to a clipping from the Smithfield Herald sent to me by a friend, whose name at the bottom is W. N. Rose, Bentonsville, N. C., I have this to say: That I was the identical soldier that volunteered to swim the creek and bring the boat across, the night of the 19th, before the battle next morning, and will, in support of the same, offer the following evidence. I will be 82 years old on the 3rd day of April, 1907:

"Yours truly,

"WM. CAVERNAUGH."

"We, the undersigned ex-Confederate soldiers, do hereby certify that we belonged to the 35th Regiment, North Carolina volunteers, and the above facts made by Wm. Cavanaugh are true.

H. W. HUMPHRY, Capt. Co. A, 35th Reg. N. C. T.

B. VENTERS, Lieut. Co. A, 35th Reg. N. C. T.

S. B. TAYLOR, Lieut. Col. 35th Reg. N. C. T.

Ransom's Brigade."

"I, F. D. Shaw, a notary public, hereby certify that I am well acquainted with the above names and know them to be gentlemen of reputation and full worthy of credit.

"F. D. SHAW, Notary Public."

This settles it as to the man that swam the creek and got the boat the night before the storming of Plymouth, N. C., in 1864, by the brigades of Generals Hoke and Ransom, and this act should make the name of Wm. Cavanaugh, Company A, 35th N. C. Regiment, famous among the thousands of noblest heroes that fought for the lost cause in 1861 to 1865.

W. N. ROSE.

Beasley, N. C.

Suspicion is the poison of friendship.—St. Augustine.